Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 18 2006
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 05-911

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE: MICHAEL R. SHEMONSKY,

Petitioner.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

MICHAEL R. SHEMONSKY
268 Washington Street
East Stroudsburg, PA 18301
570-421-8260

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Can Judge Vanaskie issue an order from the bench without a complaint or adverse party?

2. Can the F.B.I. arrest a citizen without a warrant, indictment or due cause?

3. Can a United States District judge commit perjury in an F.B.I. complaint?

4. Can an Assistant U.S. Attorney have you arrested, to keep you out of harm's way, because the U.S. Marshals were ordered to commit premeditated murder?

5. Can an Assistant U.S. Attorney call Petitioner's son, a minor at the time of the phone call, in an effort to intimidate him and libel Petitioner?

6. Can Judge Vanaskie inflict serious and irreparable harm to Atlantic Financial via an injunction on Petitioner (Appendix C)?

7. Can Judge Vanaskie issue an injunction when the pending actions were removals from state court?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questions Presented For Review	i
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved	1
Statement of the Case	1
Reasons for Granting the Writ	2
Reason for not Making Application in the District	3
Exceptional Circumstances to Warrant the Court's Discretionary Powers	3
Conclusion	4

Index to Appendices

Appendix A – Judgment order of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals No. 02-4276 and 02-4277 ..... App. 1

Appendix B – Amendment V to the United States Constitution ..... App. 6

Appendix C – 8Q under the S.E.C. Act of 1934; Executive changes filed July 22, 2003 ..... App. 7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES:

United States vs. Winstar Corp. et al., 518 US 839 (1996) 2

STATUTES:

United States Code
Title 28, Section 1651(A) 1

United States Constitution
Fifth Amendment 1, 2

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Petitioner, Michael R. Shemonsky, respectfully prays that a Writ of Mandamus be issued upon the Third Circuit Court of Appeals to compel them to void the injunction against Michael R. Shemonsky and to return the assets of Atlantic Financial plus court awarded damages from January 11, 1990.

OPINIONS BELOW

The unpublished opinions of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals appear in Appendix A.

JURISDICTION

The Court of Appeals order in this matter was filed January 3, 2003. This court's jurisdiction is invoked under Title 28 USC Section 1651(A).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment V to the United States Constitution is set forth in Appendix B, exhibit to this petition.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Michael R. Shemonsky, Petitioner, is the alter ego of Atlantic Financial, a savings and loan.

On May 1, 1982, Atlantic Financial loaned the United States government $458,654,000.00 at 45% interest compounded daily for supervisory goodwill contracts.

On August 9, 1989, the United States government breached its supervisory goodwill contracts with the passage of FIRREA, a Fifth Amendment taking.

On January 11, 1990, M. Danny Wall, the unconstitutionally appointed director of the Office of Thrift Supervision illegally and fraudulently seized Atlantic Financial even though our receivable totaled $1,064,422,970.00 from the United States government (U.S. v. Winstar Corp. et al., 518 US 839 (1996)).

On January 7, 1994, the F.B.I. illegally arrested the Petitioner without a warrant or indictment. (Violation of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.)

On January 16, 2003, Thomas Vanaskie, Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, ordered an injunction from the bench without a hearing, restraining Petitioner from filing any papers in any court pertaining to his illegal arrest and/or Atlantic Financial. (Violation of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. Shemonsky, the party seeking the writ, does not have any other means to obtain the desired relief due to fraud by the United States government.

2. Shemonsky was harmed by a prejudicial appeal by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

3. The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit erred and abused its discretion.

4. The Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania erred and abused his discretion.

5. The writ raises important and novel problems or issues of law.

REASONS FOR NOT MAKING APPLICATION IN THE DISTRICT

The writ raises constitutional issues concerning the illegal arrest by the F.B.I. and subsequent commitment by the court, as well as the illegal restraining order by the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania with multiple criminal violations by the judicial officers of the court.

EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES TO WARRANT THE COURT'S DISCRETIONARY POWERS

Petitioner bought stocks and bonds in a savings and loan, Atlantic Financial Federal, and has been arrested by the F.B.I. and committed to Butner North Carolina Mental Hospital. Also Petitioner has numerous injunctions against him, put in place by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. Petitioner has proven to the F.B.I. Bank Fraud Squad in Pennsylvania that the savings and loan crisis was indeed a beguiling by Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush. Petitioner

has found no other means of obtaining relief from any other court.

CONCLUSION

It is the opinion of Petitioner that there has been a conspiracy by the United States government and its judicial system. Therefore, petitioner seeks relief through the exercise of this Court's powers.

Dated: October 27, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL R. SHEMONSKY
268 Washington Street
East Stroudsburg, PA 18301
570-421-8260

APPENDIX A

HPS-25 UNREPORTED – NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NOS. 02-4276 & 02-4277

IN RE: MICHAEL R. SHEMONSKY,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the
Middle District of Pennsylvania

Submitted Under Rule 21, *Fed. R. App. P.*
December 11, 2002

BEFORE: *CHIEF JUDGE* BECKER,
WEIS AND GARTH, *CIRCUIT JUDGES*

(Filed January 3, 2003)

OPINION

PER CURIAM

On November 21, 2002, Michael R. Shemonsky filed two petitions for writ of mandamus. In the first petition, he requests that this Court compel the Honorable Thomas

Vanaskie, District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, "to arrest everyone" involved in an alleged conspiracy arising out of divorce proceedings in the jurisdictions of New Jersey, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, for alleged civil rights violations. We note that Shemonsky's first mandamus petition is the same mandamus petition that was denied on October 24, 2002, in his most recent federal court action, *Shemonsky v. United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania*, Civ. No. 02-cv-01410 (M.D. Pa.)

Shemonsky's second petition requests that this Court arrest the Honorable Thomas Blewitt, Magistrate Judge for the Middle District, and direct him to pay one-billion dollars in damages for alleged actions taken in connection with Shemonsky's arrest in January, 1994, and subsequent arraignment on federal criminal charges. We note that on October 24, 2002, the District Court denied a petition for writ of mandamus arising out the same set of allegations against Magistrate Judge Blewitt in *Shemonsky v. United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania*, Civ. No. 02-cv-01410 (M.D. Pa.)

Mandamus is an appropriate remedy only in the most extraordinary of situations. *Sporck v. Peil*, 759 F.2d 312, 314 (3d Cir. 1985). To justify the remedy, a petitioner must show that he has (i) no other adequate means of obtaining the desired relief and (ii) a "clear and indisputable" right to issuance of the writ. *Haines v. Liggett Group, Inc.* 975 F.2d 81, 89 (3d Cir. 1992) (citing *Kerr v. United States Dist. Court*, 426 U.S. 394, 403 (1976)). Shemonsky has not shown in either petition that he has a clear and indisputable right to relief. Accordingly, his petitions are denied.

TO THE CLERK:

Please file the foregoing opinion.

_____

Circuit Judge

HPS-25

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NOS. 02-4276 & 02-4277

IN RE: MICHAEL R. SHEMONSKY,

Petitioner

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court
for the Middle District of Pennsylvania

Submitted Under Rule 21, *Fed. R. App. P.*
December 11, 2002

BEFORE: *CHIEF JUDGE* BECKER,
WEIS AND GARTH, *CIRCUIT JUDGES*

JUDGMENT

This cause came on to be heard on two petitions for writ of mandamus. On consideration whereof, it is now here

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED by this Court that the petitions for writ of mandamus be, and the same are, denied.